# LWage Mega Spec

## 1NC

### 1NC Shell (Short)

#### Evaluate theory through competing interpretations- this means the debater with the most offense to their interp wins theory:

**1.** Reasonability invites judge intervention because what’s reasonable is subjective.

2. Brightline doesn’t solve- Maximization of fairness and education avoids the illogical and arbitrary cutoff of reasonability.

**3.** Reasonability creates a race to the bottom since it motivates debaters to use increasingly unfair strategies and get away with them with defense on theory.

4. Reasonability begs the question of their interp. If I win offense, they are unreasonable. So a. even under reasonability the debater with the most offense wins and b. it collapses to competing interps because the debater has to win their interp / counterinterp first.

5. collapses to competing interps because we have offense-defense debates about the correct brightline

**A. INTERPRETATION:** The AC must have an explicitly delineated advocacy text that specifies which employers are required to pay a living wage, **which employees are covered by living wage laws, and the level of the living wage.**

**B. VIOLATION:** They don’t.

**C. STANDARDS:**

**1. Scope of ground-**the links and scope of your aff are contingent on what policies you defend so the scope of my ground is unclear.

**There’s a huge disparity between which employees are covered by living wage laws and how high a living wage is.**

CHAMPMAN AND THOMPSON 06 [Jeff Chapman and Jeff Thompson, CREDENTIALS, “The economic impact of local living wages”, Economic Policy Institute, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp170/, February 15, 2006, DDA]

Despite having common goals, living wage laws vary considerably in practice. Most cover employees working under municipal contracts. Some also cover municipal employees, employees of businesses receiving public economic development dollars, or employees of businesses located in districts that have benefited from significant public investment. Wage levels vary from one dollar above the federal minimum wage to over twice the minimum. Some exempt nonprofit organizations, while others primarily affect human service providers.

Scope of ground is key to fairness since even if I have more or less ground it’s useless if I can’t leverage it against the aff.

And, saying that what policies you defend is implied or that you defend all of them is bad

For stable ground - The topic is vague as to what wage policies are absent specifying exactly what you defend. There are inconsistent politices like a 13 dollaar and 15 dollar wage. They can shift out of disads, Ks, and counterplans by clarifying which employers are required to pay a living wage in the 1AR. Kills fairness because they can moot the entire value of the 1nc by shifting advocacy. Stable ground outweighs predictability or quantity of ground since even if I can make arguments, they’re nullified if you can just delink in the 1ar.

**2. resolvability-** It doesn’t make sense to ask the question of a living wage in a vaccum, rather the answer to said question is based on a variety of specifics. Without spec, we both read conflicting evidence and the debate becomes 2 ships passing in the night because there’s no way to compare evidence that evaluate different. The debate becomes an irresolvable assertion war because different pieces of evidence are about different circumstances with no way to prioritize. Resolvability links to fairness because the judge can’t actually determine who is doing the better debating.

#### D. VOTERS:

1. **Fairness is a voter** since debate is a competitive activity that requires an equal opportunity for the judge to know who’s doing the better debating, which is impossible to do objectively if one debater has an arbitrary advantage. Fairness is a gateway issue to evaluating substance because you can’t tell if they are actually winning the argument through skill.

***Drop the argument and that means he loses his advocacy. He can’t spec in the 1AR because the abuse is about what he should have done.***

Drop the debater

a) gateway issue- Drop the argument asks you to evaluate a round without the abuse or theory, but it’s impossible evaluate a round that never occurred because every aspect of the debate in terms of strategy and arguments would have been different had the abuse not happened. Vote on theory because it’s the only unskewed layer.

b) time skew- Rejecting the argument furthers the abuse because they kick it for a positive time tradeoff. I lose all the time I invested on theory and I had to cover the argument substantively to cover my bases.

c) deterrence- only giving the loss will deter future abuse, otherwise they drop the arg and exploit the time tradeoff of me reading theory. Minimizing abuse comes first because it’s the purpose of theory.

d) norms- to set a precedent for the best norms of debate, which is the purpose of establishing theoretical interps

Finally, There’s no impact to over-punishment. Abuse is prevention of equal access to the ballot but punishment is a response to already unequal access which means it’s impossible for it to be abusive itself.

And having a text is key

1. Prefer a text since I can hold you to it as opposed to CX questions can’t access later. Text is more stable and accountable.
2. Reasons why CX is better don’t prove that a text isn’t also good – we can still ask clarification questions in my world so it’s not competitive with my interp.
3. CX is for strategy, not to find out what you defend, so I shouldn’t have to ask. And this outweighs time spent outlining your advocacy – that takes seconds as opposed to a line of questioning that can last minutes especially since it’s out of your time not mine. Further, it’s just defense, the fact that I should clarify does not mean that you did specify, it means you could have.
4. **The way to addresss minimum wage policies is dependent on how they’re implemented, so you need to specify in order for me to leverage the link of disad on case.**

### 1NC Shell (Long)

#### Evaluate theory through competing interpretations- this means the debater with the most offense to their interp wins theory:

**1.** Reasonability invites judge intervention because what’s reasonable is subjective.

2. Brightline doesn’t solve- Maximization of fairness and education avoids the illogical and arbitrary cutoff of reasonability.

**3.** Reasonability creates a race to the bottom since it motivates debaters to use increasingly unfair strategies and get away with them with defense on theory.

4. Reasonability begs the question of their interp. If I win offense, they are unreasonable. So a. even under reasonability the debater with the most offense wins and b. it collapses to competing interps because the debater has to win their interp / counterinterp first.

5. collapses to competing interps because we have offense-defense debates about the correct brightline

**A. INTERPRETATION:** The AC must have an explicitly delineated advocacy text that specifies which employers are required to pay a living wage, **which employees are covered by living wage laws, and the level of the living wage.**

**B. VIOLATION:** They don’t.

**C. STANDARDS:**

**1. Scope of ground-**the links and scope of your aff are contingent on what policies you defend so the scope of my ground is unclear.

**a) there are significant economic differences between laws that require different groups of employers to pay a living wage so the best ground is specific to their advocacy.**

ADAMS AND NEUMARK 03 [Scott Adams and David Neumark, Adams is Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. Neumark is Senior Fellow, Public Policy Institute of California; Professor of Economics, Michigan State University; and Research Associate, NBER, “Living Wage Effects: New and Improved Evidence”, National Bureau of Economic Research, May 2003, DDA]

Aside from these issues related to workers directly affected by business assistance living wage laws and the confounding influences of the living wage campaigns generally, contractor and business assistance provisions of living wage laws may have qualitatively different effects. We conjecture that a few factors could lead to stronger effects of business assistance provisions. In particular, in the case of a contractor-only law, it is typically required that employers pay the mandated wage to workers for work done as part of the contract. For example, the Oakland City Manager’s declaration of compliance with the city’s living wage law mandates “a prescribed minimum level of compensation to their employees for the time their employees work on City of Oakland contracts.” Assuming that [since] contractors’ employees do some work on city contracts, as well as other work, employers can mitigate the costs of a living wage in a couple of ways. First, they can reallocate their higher-skilled or higher-seniority (and therefore higher-wage) labor to the contract work and their lower-wage labor to the non-contract work, in order to comply. This may still entail some inefficiencies but could moderate any cost-increasing effects of living wages. In addition, other than the barrier imposed by the minimum wage, employers could even reduce wages on non-contract work. Of course the extent to which employers can take these steps depends on the share of their business tied up in city contracts; if contracts are a small component of sales or labor costs, it is conceivable that the effects of a living wage law could be largely dissipated. In contrast, there may be fewer avenues for mitigating the costs (and therefore the effects) of living wage laws for employers covered under business assistance provisions. For example, an establishment created with the help of business assistance from a city would appear to have no choice but to pay all employees no less than the mandated living wage for all of their work. In addition, while contractors can reduce the share of their business with the city in response to a living wage (and similarly cities can shift business to higher-wage employers), business assistance recipients may have less leeway as they may have accepted long-term benefits such as bond financing or tax relief in return for locating in the jurisdiction. In some cases, at least, relocation costs seem likely to far outweigh costs from shifting business away from city contracts.32

**b) There’s a huge disparity between which employees are covered by living wage laws and how high a living wage is.**

CHAMPMAN AND THOMPSON 06 [Jeff Chapman and Jeff Thompson, CREDENTIALS, “The economic impact of local living wages”, Economic Policy Institute, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp170/, February 15, 2006, DDA]

Despite having common goals, living wage laws vary considerably in practice. Most cover employees working under municipal contracts. Some also cover municipal employees, employees of businesses receiving public economic development dollars, or employees of businesses located in districts that have benefited from significant public investment. Wage levels vary from one dollar above the federal minimum wage to over twice the minimum. Some exempt nonprofit organizations, while others primarily affect human service providers.

Clearly defined scope of ground for both sides is key to fairness and education since even if I have more or less ground, if I’m not aware of it, I can’t leverage it against the aff.

And, saying that what policies you defend is implied or that you defend all of them is bad

1. contradictory ground - you allow inconsistent living wage policies like a 13 dollar and a 15 dollar wage- contradictory ground is the strongest link to fairness and education since you make the round undebatable if you defend two mutually exclusive actions.
2. stable ground - The topic is vague as to what wage policies are absent specifying exactly what you defend. They can shift out of disads, Ks, and counterplans by clarifying which employers are required to pay a living wage in the 1AR. Kills fairness because they can moot the entire value of the 1nc by shifting advocacy. *[Also means you kill CP ground since it’s unclear what would be competitive with the aff mechanism - I can’t contest your perms since you didn’t have a text in the AC. This is in-round abuse because it skewed the strategy behind the positions I chose*] Stable ground outweighs predictability or quantity of ground since even if I can make arguments, they’re nullified if you can just delink in the 1ar. And having a text is key
3. Prefer a text since I can hold you to it as opposed to CX questions can’t access later. Text is more stable and accountable.
4. Reasons why CX is better don’t prove that a text isn’t also good – we can still ask clarification questions in my world so it’s not competitive with my interp.
5. CX is for strategy, not to find out what you defend, so I shouldn’t have to ask. And this outweighs time spent outlining your advocacy – that takes seconds as opposed to a line of questioning that can last minutes especially since it’s out of your time not mine. Further, it’s just defense, the fact that I should clarify does not mean that you did specify, it means you could have.
6. **The way to addresss minimum wage policies is dependent on how they’re implemented, so you need to specify in order for me to leverage the link of disad on case.**

This also links to clash because they deny us the ability to have a specific deep discussion about the law that they mandate. We’ll both read conflicting evidence because different living wage laws have different effects with no way to compare them. Clash is key to education because it allows argument analysis and in depth comparison, the key skills of debate.

**3. Education- Huge variance in minimum wage implementation, discussing specific implementation strategies is a key aspect of determining whether the aff is good.**

**a) BENASSI 11 [Chiara Benassi, London School of Economics Ph.D. student in Employment Relations and Organisational behavior since 2010, “The Implementation of Minimum Wage: Challenges and Creative Solutions”, Global Labour University (international network of universities, trade unions, research institutes, think tanks and the International Labour Organisation that develops and implements university post graduate programmes on labour and globalization for trade unionists and other labour experts; undertakes joint research and organizes international discussion for a on global labour issues; publishes textbooks, research and discussion papers on labour and globalization issues), Published by the International Labour Organisation in 2011, DDA]**

**Minimum wage is one of the most used instruments** **for affecting** the **wage distribution** on the labour market. In fact, minimum wage is provided by law in 90% of the world’s countries; however, **its implementation varies highly in** both **approach and effectiveness** across countries. Because of its potential redistributive effect, setting a minimum wage as a matter of policy is a contentious political issue and object of controversies among the government, workers’ organizations and employers. **Despite** (or because of?) the **controversy, there still lacks** a **coherent debate about** effective **minimum wage implementation strategies.** A review of academic literature reveals the same gap in the research: **the minimum wage issue is widely debated as a matter of policy, but its implementation is** often **left out. Some** **authors deal with the question** of legitimacy of minimum wage **from** **a philosophical and legal perspective,** discussing the minimum wage **in reference to** the ideal of **social justice** **and** of **civil rights** in different societies (Levin-Waldman 2009; Gaski 2004). **The majority of the debate over minimum wage** however mainly **focuses on** its **macroeconomic** **effects.** The effect of minimum wage on employment at the national level, as well as its application to specific groups (e.g. youth) or the informal sector represent some of the most controversial matters. **Adopting different theoretical approaches, some authors support the negative correlation between employment and minimum wage, while others find no correlation or** even **positive effects** of minimum wage.1 Parallel and equally controversial debates have been conducted on the impact of minimum wage on prices as well as on income distribution3. **Despite** the aforementioned **ongoing controversies, discussions about effective minimum wage implementation must** also **take shape.** The research on this issue is still at a very early stage despite the practical relevance of this aspect; however, there are some **studies** conducted in developing and industrialized countries that report that the presence of legal provisions for minimum wage does not guarantee that it will actually protect the workforce (i.a. Jones 1997; Strobl and Walsch 2001; BIS 2010a). These findings **suggest that minimum wage needs further implementation mechanisms besides the traditional legislative top-down approach in order to serve as useful regulation tool.**

**b) They kill education- 90% of policymaking is implementation rather than analysis.**

**ELMORE**

*[Richard F. Elmore, Professor of political science at University of Washington, Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 94, No. 4, 1980, DDA]*

The emergence of implementation as a subject for policy analysis coincides closely with the discovery by policy analysts that decisions are not self-executing. Analysis of policy choices matters very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood. In answering the question, "What percentage of the work of achieving a desired governmental action is done when the preferred analytic alternative has been identified?" Allison estimated that, in the normal case, it was about 10 percent, leaving the remaining 90 percent [of the work of achieving a desired governmental action is done] in the realm of implementation. Hence, in Nelson's terms, "the core of analysis of alternatives becomes the prediction of how alternative organizational structures will behave over . .. time." But the task of prediction is vastly complicated by the absence of a coherent body of organizational theory, making it necessary to posit several alternative models of organization.

Their aff avoids all questions of implementation and instead focuses on the macro-level idea of living wage laws. Also kills ground because I can’t contest 90% of reasons to have living wage.

*Weighing:*

*Last chance to have debates on this topic, reversibility issue*

*In-depth topic debates are key to determine who is the better debater because it allows the debater who best understands the topic to win, not just who is better at tricks or framework. Better substantive debater is the most fair way to determine how you vote: a) the resolution is the mutually agreed upon point of debate, b) it’s what we’ve explored in greatest depth- it lets us showcase our skills the most because we’ve spent the most time prepping the topic. (If we both show up at a hot dog eating contest and are given cheesecake to eat, that doesn’t show the better hot dog eater)*

Depth over breadth:

a) mirrors real world- real policy discussions are about whether one policy proposal would be good or bad, not on the net whether a hundred are good or bad

b) I Co-opt both- we capture breadth by talking about a new issue each round, but get depth at the same time by going in depth on each issue rather than just getting cursory overviews of everything that provide no education

c) card-

#### Studies of US science classrooms prove students learn more from focusing on fewer topics more in depth than many topics in less depth

#### SCIENCE DAILY 09 [Science Daily, “Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, In High School Science Courses”, Source- University of Virginia, Published by ScienceDaily, March 10, 2009, DDA]

Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. The study relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic. The study explored differences between science disciplines, teacher decisions about classroom activities, and out-of-class projects and homework. The researchers carefully controlled for differences in student backgrounds. The study also points out that standardized testing, which seeks to measure overall knowledge in an entire discipline, may not capture a student's high level of mastery in a few key science topics. Teachers who "teach to the test" may not be optimizing their students' chance of success in college science courses, Tai noted. "President Obama has challenged the nation to become the most educated in the world by having the largest proportion of college graduates among its citizens in the coming decade," Tai said. "To meet this challenge, it is imperative that we use the research to inform our educational practice." The study was part of the Factors Influencing College Science Success study, funded by the National Science Foundation.

**3. resolvability-** It doesn’t make sense to ask the question of a living wage in a vaccum, rather the answer to said question is based on a variety of specifics. Without spec, we both read conflicting evidence and the debate becomes 2 ships passing in the night because there’s no way to compare evidence that evaluate different things , that’s the Benassi evidence. [*which links to clash]*. The debate becomes an irresolvable assertion war because different pieces of evidence are about different circumstances with no way to prioritize. Resolvability links to fairness because the judge can’t actually determine who is doing the better debating.

*[explain hypothetical in 2nr], just b/c it didn’t happen in this debate doesn't mean there isn’t real abuse, this has happened in the past, don't make me prove the abuse by trying to engage substantively because then I’ll lose*

#### D. VOTERS:

1. **Fairness is a voter** since debate is a competitive activity that requires an equal opportunity for the judge to know who’s doing the better debating, which is impossible to do objectively if one debater has an arbitrary advantage. Fairness is a gateway issue to evaluating substance because you can’t tell if they are actually winning the argument through skill.

***CAN’T DROP ARG ON SPEC BECAUSE IT’S SOMEHTING THEY SHOULD HAVE DONE AND WE CAN’T GO BACK IN TIME.***

Drop the debater

a) gateway issue- Drop the argument asks you to evaluate a round without the abuse or theory, but it’s impossible evaluate a round that never occurred because every aspect of the debate in terms of strategy and arguments would have been different had the abuse not happened. Vote on theory because it’s the only unskewed layer.

b) time skew- Rejecting the argument furthers the abuse because they kick it for a positive time tradeoff. I lose all the time I invested on theory and I had to cover the argument substantively to cover my bases.

c) deterrence- only giving the loss will deter future abuse, otherwise they drop the arg and exploit the time tradeoff of me reading theory. Minimizing abuse comes first because it’s the purpose of theory.

d) norms- to set a precedent for the best norms of debate, which is the purpose of establishing theoretical interps

Finally, There’s no impact to over-punishment. Abuse is prevention of equal access to the ballot but punishment is a response to already unequal access which means it’s impossible for it to be abusive itself.

Education is a voter- debate is an educational activity founded on the basis of teaching debaters valuable skills for the rest of their lives so they detract from the only long-term goal of debate. Vote on education because a) the substance they chose to run destroys any potential value of debate, b) you have a role as an educator to discourage and punish uneducational practices by voting them down for ruining the educational value of this round

## 2NR

### Weighing Arguments

#### Spec outweighs their 1AR theory shell

a) temporality- I was forced into my negative strategy by their abusive lack of specification so the 1ar abuse story was caused by them

b) resolvability- even if what I did made it a little harder for them to win, they make the entire round entirely irresolvable because we read evidence that conflict in their conclusions because they address different living wage policies which means the judge can never objectively evaluate who is doing the better debating

c) stable ground- even if I make the round harder them, it’s better to have bad ground then unstable ground—they can shift advocacy in the 1ar to take out all NC offense which makes it impossible for me to generate a reason to vote negative

*If they don’t have education links*

#### Prefer my interp if I have links to fairness and education and they only have links to fairness- even if fairness and education are better in a vacuum, a marginal increase in fairness is outweighed by a complete decrease of education. This means reject the interp if I win a link to fairness and education and they don’t link to education. Additionally, there is no possible way they can link to education—their interp literally removes a portion of the topic literature without expanding what we learn about in any way.

### AT- Normal Means

#### Living wages are vastly different in their implementation—no two wages are the same so it’s meaningless to talk about a “living wage” absent context.

#### BERNSTEIN 04 [Jared Bernstein, senior economist at the Economic Policy Institute [fix], “The Living The Living Wage Movement. What Is It, Why Is It, and What’s Known about Its Impact?”, Published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, December 2004, DDA]

There are something on the order of 100 living wage ordinances in place, and no two are the same. Table 3.1 provides a sample of existing ordinances. Their differences can be understood in the following framework: who is covered on the employer and employee side, and what is the nature of the coverage (e.g., what is the wage level, are fringe benefits included, are there local hiring restrictions)? Luce (2003) points out that seventy-four existing ordinances cover employers who contract with the city to provide a service. The next largest group covers businesses that receive some type of subsidy under the rubric of economic development assistance, such as a tax abatement, a below- market-cost loan, or the below-cost provision of a city service or good (e.g., as when a city agrees to pay for new infrastructure to facilitate a new factory or office building).1 On the employee side, coverage can be specific to industry, occupation, or part-time or full-time status. Ordinances can be quite specific about who is covered. For example, in Los Angeles, nonsupervisory workers who work for a service contractor are covered, but if such a worker provides goods under the city contract, they would not be covered. Thus, a security guard who works for a firm contracted to provide services to the city (e.g., cleaning or busing services) would be covered, while a guard who worked for a firm providing the city with goods (e.g., building supplies) would not be covered. In Portland, occupational coverage is very specific as only janitors, security guards, and parking attendants are covered by the ordinance. Turning again to [in] Los Angeles, there is a distinction made between workers employed by those firms who contract with the city, and those working for firms who receive a subsidy. Any worker meeting the industry or occupational criteria is covered in the former case. But in the latter case, the ordinance language covers only a worker who “expends at least half of his or her time on the funded [i.e., subsidized] project” (http://www.laane.org/lw/docs-lacitylwordinance.pdf). As a result of bargaining during the political process, certain exemptions from coverage usually find their way into most of the ordinances. For example, contracts and subsidies below a certain dollar value may be exempted. A glance at table 3.1 shows the range of these values in different localities. In Arlington County, Virginia the threshold in $100,000; in Cincinnati, it is $20,000. In Boston, the original law stated that direct service contracts with the city must be fore over $100,000 for the living wage ordinance to be applied (for subcontractors, the limit was $25,000), but advocates later successfully campaigned to lower the direct contractors’ cutoff to $25,000 in order to increase coverage. The Oakland, California law requires coverage for workers on service contracts of at least $25,000 and development assistance of $100,000 or more (including the tenants and leaseholders of the subsidy recipient). In Chicago and other cities, nonprofits that contract with the city are exempted; in other cities, they are included, though there often exists a threshold here as well in order to exempt smaller providers. As noted previously, hours worked can also be a coverage criterion. In Jersey City, all workers under service contracts are covered by the living wage, but only full-time workers are required to receive vacation and health benefits. In Milwaukee, on the other hand, the ordinance has very specific language to cover[s] all workers, including part-time and temporary workers.

### AT- CX Checks

*doesn’t link back to their counterinterp- so not offense for then under competing interps*

1. I should get to use CX strategically to get concessions and shouldn’t have to give up my CX time for them to explain a plan that they should have read in their speech.
2. Judges don’t flow CX so they can misconstrue what happened. Kills fairness because they can shift advocacy in the 1AR.
3. Specification in the AC with a text is key to textual competition for counterplans – otherwise the 1AR could permute even if they functionally allow it to compete. Textual competition is best because it’s the most objective.
4. CX clarification denies pre-round prep which is crucial to fair and educational debates – it’s the time when the entire negative strategy is formulated – otherwise the aff has a prep advantage because only they know what they’ll specify and go all-out prepping it but neg has to prep all employers. Also doesn’t allow the neg to prep during the 1AC.
5. Infinitely regressive – this justifies the aff just saying “Plan – ask me about it in cross-x”
6. Not verifiable. We can’t know if they would have actually specified. People are trained in CX to be shady as possible- no way I could get an actual concession.
7. My interp subsumes theirs- there’s specification in both worlds but under my interp spec comes earlier (in the AC), so I have more time to prep which ensures clash
8. It’s just defense- Reasons why CX is better don’t prove that a text isn’t also good – we can still ask clarification questions in my world so it’s not competitive with my interp.

### Standards Analysis

#### AT- predictability:

1. Weighing- Extend from the stable ground standard- outweighs predictability because it doesn’t matter if I can make arguments if you can delink them in the 1AR.
2. Non-verifiable: We don’t know what I could’ve predicted out of round. Verifiability is a side constraint on abuse claims because it prevents judges from voting on abuse that didn’t occur.
3. Terminal defense- The evidence in then the ground standard prove that I can predict what types of aff you would read.
4. Terminal defense- disclosure solves all predictability issues.
5. Literature checks- I need a solvency advocate
6. Lit chekcs- there’s a limit of plans
7. turn- absent spec you can make bogus reasons you solve or what your advocacy is in the 1ar which is far less predictable than an advocacy text that I could research- means you can’t solve the benefit b/c debaters will still allude to pans just in ways even further away from topic lit
8. in round predictablility- you can escape solvency indicts, CPs, etc which my shell roves outweighs out of round predictability because 1. impacts to structural abuse that directly alters win conditions rather than just making it slightly hardr to win or lose which things like speed, font size, etc all effect, 2) more tangible b/c out of round predictability is affected by vaious factors including resources, coahes, etc- while your ability to have an unpredictable in round strat is more likely to cause a direct structural skew

### AT- phil ground

1. Terminal defense- no harm to phil ground under my interp- you can read all the same normative theories of justice, we just also need policy education
2. Turn- Diminishing returns after lots of clash on 1 issue, it’s better to spread the debate out over 2 layers- phil and topical debate.

**And, Prefer topic-specific debate to ethical debate.**

**LAWRENCE 12** [Ryan Lawrence, Ryan has been involved in the activity for over ten years. Spending the last three as the Director of Forensics at Lynbrook High School in San Jose, CA, Ryan worked with over two hundred students across multiple events. He has coached debaters to late out-rounds at the California State Tournament, NFL Nationals, and semifinals of the TOC. He has extensive experience coaching debaters for both the local and national circuits and draws on experience in multiple debate events to take a well-rounded approach to both coaching and camp instruction. As a high school debater, Ryan won the Stanford Invitational and Round Robin, placed among the top 16 seeds at TOC, and qualified to both NFL Nationals and the TOC twice. In college, Ryan was on the number one ranked parli team in the nation, “Affirmative Ethics Choice”, Victory Briefs Daily, < http://victorybriefs.com/vbd/2012/03/affirmative-ethics-choice-by-ryan-lawrence>, DDA]

**First**, the **ethics debate has been going on for several hundred years and has not come even close to being resolved**. To think that **the discussion** that happens **in a 45 minute debate** has any educational value on an issue that is so deep, nuanced, and irresolvable **is delusional. Any education** to be derived from this issue **is best accessed by just reading articles**. To call the dilapidated ethical discussions that currently occur in most LD rounds “good debate” is a giant misnomer. **Second**, the **ethics** debate **trades off with** a **discussion of the resolution. Since debaters have** a **limited** window of **opportunity to debate the topic**, we should **prefer topic-specific discussions over generic ethics**. Squads should not be able to run the same argument(s) for five years on the negative in LD instead of making new arguments on each resolution. What is more, if debate is supposed to educate its participants to become better-informed citizens and critical thinkers. An **ivory tower discussion of meta-ethics has little practical value** for high school debaters moving forward into college and beyond.

Every second we waste on philosophy trades off with an opportunity to learn about the topic.

### AT- limits

1. Non-unique: Affs can generate offense from the same scenarios whether they specify one advocacy or not.
2. Terminal defense- disclosure of the plan text solves for lack of limits.
3. Defense- generics solve back for aff specifying a hyper-specific scenario.
4. Begs the question- Just because the aff reads a specific advocacy doesn’t mean we can’t limit how they are able to advocate their plan in other ways e.g. US-only
5. Only 3 different types of limits- generic arguments against different types of implementation apply. The only difference could be situational factors based on wihch government does the plan, but my interp doesn’t make them spec the government.

### AT solvency evidence checks back

1. solvency evidence doesn’t define the advocacy- it’s just an advantage to the advocacy so all the theoretical objections still apply
2. begs the question of whether you should be reading that solvency evidence
3. just defense- shows you might not have shifted- also doesn’t answer back the scope of ground or resolvability claims

### AT pre roundsolves

1. It’s both debaters’ burden to be fair, not their opponents’ burden to make them fair
2. Impossible- there are infinite things to check pre-round
3. text more reliable- pre round discussions not flowed, and debaters can find semantic loopholes to get out of theory violations
4. turn- preround itnerps bad because they doesn’t account for context of arguments in relation to constructives

### AT- links of omissions

#### Overview:

you can do it too

checking abuse good- encourages lack of clarity in AC

key to T Ground

I’ll concede preround

aff can be unpredictable

neg can read whatever they want so no ground lost

aff can spec the best ground for them

spec outweighs

Prep altruistic theory bad

at- avoids friv theory

framework weighing spec

strat skew- you can shift

judge intervention- if you spec in 2n, harder to weigh claims

### Extra Evidence

#### WILSON 12 [Mark Wilson, Mark Wilson is a former deputy assistant secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor. He currently heads Applied Economic Strategies, LLC, and has more than 25 years of experience researching labor force economic issues, “The Negative Effects of Minimum Wage Laws he Negative Effects of Minimum Wage Laws”, Policy Analysis No. 701, Published by the Cato Institute, DDA]

It is important to note that different academic studies on the minimum wage may examine different regions, industries, or types of workers. In each case, different effects may predominate. A federal minimum wage in- crease will impose a different impact on the fast-food restaurant industry than the defense contractor industry, and a different effect on lower-cost Alabama than higher-cost Manhat- tan. This is why scholarly reviews of many aca- demic studies are important.

## AT- You get all links

at- links of omission bad

arguments to answer

1. not relevant under the aff framework
2. neg needs to specify everything too